

I am extremely disappointed that the Congress has reacted to this agriculture emergency situation by sending me a bill that fails to provide an adequate safety net for our farmers. I have repeatedly stated that I would veto any emergency farm assistance bill if it did not adequately address our farmers' immediate needs, and this bill does not do enough.

The lack of sufficient emergency aid for farmers in this bill is particularly problematic in light of the bill's other provisions that affect farmers and their rural communities. Cutting edge agricultural research is absolutely essential to improve our farmers' productivity and to maintain their advantage over our competitors around the world. But this bill eliminates the \$120 million in competitive research grants for this year that I strongly supported and signed into law just last June. It also blocks the \$60 million from the Fund for Rural America provided through that same bill, preventing needed additional rural development funds that would help our Nation's rural communities to diversify their economies and improve their quality of life. The bill also cuts spending for our food safety initiative in half, denying funds for research, public education, and other food safety improvements.

Many of our most vulnerable farmers have also had to face an obstacle that no one in America ever should have to confront: racial discrimination. Over 1,000 minority farmers have filed claims of discrimination by USDA's farm loan programs in the 1980s and early 1990s that the statute of limitations bars from being addressed. While I am pleased that this legislation contains a provision waiving the statute of limitations, I am disappointed that it does not contain the language included in the Senate's version of this bill, which accelerates the resolution of the cases, provides claimants with a fair and full court review if they so choose, and covers claims stemming from USDA's housing loan programs.

Therefore, as I return this bill, I again call on the Congress to send me a comprehensive plan, before this session ends, that adequately responds to the very real needs of our farmers at this difficult time.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 7, 1998.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message of the President to the bill, H.R. 4101, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3150, BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-799) on the resolution (H. Res. 586) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3150) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 1804, JOHN MCKINLEY FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1804) to designate the Federal building located at 210 Seminary Street in Florence, Alabama, as the "John McKinley Federal Building" and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 4668, JOHN T. MYERS FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4668) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 30 North 7th Street in Terre Haute, Indiana, as the "John T. Myers Federal Building" and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2263.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2263.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 578) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the print of the Committee on Science entitled "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy" should serve as a framework for future deliberations on congressional science policy and funding.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 578

Whereas the United States must maintain and improve its preeminent position in science and technology in order to advance human understanding of the universe and all it contains, and to improve the lives, health, and freedom of all peoples; and

Whereas the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives is hereby submitting a print to Congress entitled "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the print from the Committee on Science entitled "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy" should serve as a framework for future deliberations on congressional science policy and funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor today in support of H. Res. 578, which asks the House to endorse the Science Committee's National Science Policy Study, produced by our friend and colleague from Michigan the Committee Vice Chairman (Mr. EHLERS). The study "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy" is the result of over a year's work by the committee and reflects an approach to science policy that has earned the support of both sides of the aisle.

We have all heard the expression "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Well, the clear message of this report is that, while not exactly broke, America's science policy is nonetheless in need of some pretty significant maintenance.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, this then is not a visionary document, but it is, I think, a document for visionaries. After all, that is what scientists are, and it is important that we find ways to support them for the contributions they make to our national security, our health and our welfare, and this study succeeds in doing just that.

In my view what makes this report different from other science policy reports published by various groups over the years, some of them very good, is the Committee on Science's intention to act on its recommendations in future oversight hearings in legislation. Indeed this report should not be seen as the end, but rather the beginning of a long process that will involve Congress, the Executive Branch, the States, universities and industry all working together.

Mr. Speaker, this report has generated a great deal of excitement within the scientific community, and before concluding my remarks I would like to share with the House some statements in support of this document from our colleagues and in the Executive Branch.

Dr. Neal Lane, the President's Science Adviser, said he found the report to be harmonious with the President's established science policy goals, and he commended it for underscoring the importance of sustaining and nurturing America's world-leading science and technology enterprise.

Dr. Rita Colwell, Director of the National Science Foundation also praised the report noting its emphasis on the critical role of Federal support for fundamental research and especially merit based investments in university research. Doctor Colwell was also gratified that the report highlights the singular role that math, science and technology education play in any discussions of national science policy.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of these statements in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF DR. NEAL LANE

In general, I find the Committee's report to be harmonious with the President's established science policy goals. I commend Representative Ehlers for underscoring the im-

portance of sustaining and nurturing America's world-leading science and technology enterprise. Half of our economic productivity in the last half-century is attributable to technological innovation and the science that supports it.

The report's recommendations on the importance of education concur with the President's views that the degree to which our nation flourishes in the 21st century will rest upon our success in developing a well-educated workforce able to embrace the rapid pace of technological change.

I hope this report will serve as a catalyst for broad-based bipartisan Congressional support of the Administration's thoughtful investments across the entire science and technology portfolio. Such a partnership to stimulate scientific discovery and new technologies will take America into the new century well equipped for the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

I look forward to working with House Science Committee Vice Chairman Ehlers and other members of Congress to ensure that our national science policy keeps in step with a changing world.

STATEMENT BY DR. RITA COLWELL

I want to commend Rep. Vern Ehlers of his diligent work in preparing this report on national science policy. I am particularly pleased that the report emphasizes the critical role of federal support for fundamental research, and especially for merit based investments in university research. The technological developments that are key to economic growth, public health, and national prosperity all rely on discoveries occurring at and across the frontiers of science and engineering.

I am also gratified that Rep. Ehlers has highlighted the singular role that math, science and technology education play in any discussion of national science policy. We cannot expect to maintain a system of world class research unless we have broad support from an informed public, and we cannot have an informed public unless we commit ourselves to improving public science literacy. I look forward to working closely with Rep. Ehlers in fostering widespread awareness and discussion of the issues raised in this report.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the Nation's scientific enterprise is too important to our future to be left on auto pilot. In adopting House Resolution 578 and endorsing the National Science Policy Study the House will be sending an unmistakable signal that America's scientific enterprise will no longer be taken for granted in the Halls of Congress, and the real work will begin of turning the ideas in this report into sound policy that is good for science and good for the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 578, and I commend my colleague the honorable gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for the significant effort to bring forward a comprehensive science policy report, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for allowing it to come this far. The report of-

fers a guide and framework for continued focus on the importance of science as well as an outline for future congressional scientific discussions and deliberations regarding policy and funding options. The report, however, lacks significant input on issues of major concern.

My Committee on Science colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), and I offered dissenting views for inclusion as a means to strengthen the report. We find the report needs to address four critical areas: the role of under represented populations in the fields of science and technology, social and behavioral sciences, K-12 science and math education and the challenges of environmental quality.

The role of unrepresented populations:

This report makes only passing mention of the role of unrepresented populations as African Americans, hispanic and people with disabilities in the field of science and technology. It is essential that any science policy document address the need to create a policy to include these populations in our Nation's science and technology efforts. If we do not, we will have a technology divide between Americans.

For example, presently the percentage of white households owning computers is 40.8 percent as compared to 19.3 percent of African American households and 19.4 percent of hispanic households. In addition, 39 percent of black students in public schools have access to computers at school compared with 56 percent of white students. Solving this problem is crucial because from 1996 to year 2006 employment in science and engineering occupations is expected to increase at more than three times the rate of any other occupations. At the same time some projections state that by year 2000, two-thirds of the new entrants into the American work force will be made up of minorities and women. But the number of hispanic and African American first year graduate enrollment in science and engineering fields dropped by 16.2 percent and 19.3 percent respectively from 1996 to 1997. Taken together, these trends spell disaster as a whole. Whole generation of young people may be left behind unable to ride the technological wave.

To begin this process we recommend:

1. The development of programs to involve under-represented communities in the field of science and technology. For example, the National Science Foundation's urban systemic and rural systemic initiative programs focus on a specialized math and science curricula at the high school level. Programs which are based on variables such as household income will improve the education of our youth. High schools with a majority of low-income students have been shown to lack adequate science, engineering, math and technology curricula.

The involvement of under-represented populations in the scientific community by partnership programs between historically black colleges and universities, hispanic-serving institutions, large research institutions and corporate industry. Cooperative research and development agreements, the CRADAs, is an excellent opportunity for collaborations, provide role models and a support system for smaller institutions. However recent National Science Foundation data show from 1993 to 1994 that research institutions received approximately \$12.7 billion from 10 Federal agencies. Ten billion dollars of this amount was allocated to the top 100 research universities, but not one historically black or historically hispanic university received a substantial amount. Only \$140 million went to the top 81 historically black and historically hispanic producing students while John Hopkins alone received \$701 million. More needs to be done to develop the CRADAs with minority institutions of higher education if we are to see more minorities in the fields of science and technology.

In offering these views it is our hope that any future congressional conversations include the aforementioned in an effort to create a national science policy which is sound, diverse and inclusive. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) will control the balance of the time on the minority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the author of this report.

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the House this evening to speak regarding the report of the Committee on Science, Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy, that I have spent much of the last year working on.

We started this mammoth effort just one year ago. It has involved a tremendous amount of work on the part of myself, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and our staffs, and has had the full support of the Speaker, and I certainly wish to thank them all for their support and their work.

I consider the release of this report to be a commencement; it is a beginning and not an end. It is intended to serve as the foundation for continued discussion within the Committee on Science, within the Congress and within the Nation regarding the future funding of science and policy decisions relating thereto. This report was not intended to be an end in itself, but rather to stimulate discussion and pro-

vide direction for the Congress and for the Committee on Science in future deliberation on this topic.

I am certainly delighted by the reception the report has received up to this point. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) has named some of the responses we have received, those from the Director of the National Science Foundation, from members of the bipartisan Senate Science and Technology Caucus, and from the White House in the person of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy. All of them have indicated support for the report, and similar letters from many scientists, scientific organizations and universities have been pouring into our office and into the chairman's office.

The only comments that we received reflecting reservations agree with and support most of the report, but are concerned about what is not in the report. In other words, they believe that we should have gone further, and indeed we should have and would have in certain subject areas had we had the time.

In particular I would like to respond to the comments of the gentlewoman from Texas who spoke just before me. I appreciate and agree with much of what she just said. There is a great need for us to continue our work in the area of underrepresented populations. I am pleased to report and I do acknowledge in the report, that the instigation, the seed for this report, arose from an African American, Dr. Homer Neal of the University of Michigan, who was Chairman of the U.M. Physics Department when I was in the Michigan State Senate. He invited me to the campus, and we began discussions regarding science and science policy. He eventually became Vice President of Research and then Interim President of the University of Michigan and was instrumental in pulling together a large number of scientists—administrators from major universities to begin discussions on this topic. They met with me, they met with the previous chairman of the Committee on Science, Mr. Walker, and then Dr. Neal organized a symposium at the University of Michigan which was instrumental in beginning the process of developing a science policy in this Nation.

In preparing this report we sought input from the scientific community. I have personally spoken to or with approximately 10,000 scientists and perhaps two thousand nonscientists over the course of the past year. In addition, we started a web site. We have received over 300 E-mails and well over 50 letters, very thoughtful letters, I might add, from scientists across the country. We have held seven hearings specifically on this topic, and in addition to that last year held four hearings on science, math, engineering and technology education, something that is extremely important to this country. We listened very carefully to what every group or individual had to say,

and I believe this report reflects much of what we have learned.

But as important as what we learned from these sources was the conviction that we started with.

□ 2030

Our goal, our vision, was that America ought to maintain and improve her preeminent position in science and technology in order, first of all, to advance human understanding of the universe and all that it contains, and, second, to improve the lives, health, and freedoms of all peoples on this planet.

Science—including the physical, natural, life and social sciences, math and engineering can help bring about this vision. The scientific and technological enterprise is critical to bringing about advances in understanding that help ensure that we can maintain our national defense, keep people healthy, and bring about prosperity.

I might add that, if we can maintain people's health and their prosperity, we have introduced a great deal of stability which very naturally will lead to greater democracy in this planet. I truly believe that science and technology are the key to our economic future—as a Nation, and as a planet.

But for science to continue to exert its beneficial effects on society, the scientific enterprise must be kept strong and sustainable. Much of our report is devoted to recommendations for doing so.

We have identified three major areas needing attention. (1) We must have continued discoveries at the scientific frontier; (2) we need research advances in the private sector; and (3) we must improve our system of education from preschool through graduate school.

These are critical areas to address because, first of all, future advances in fundamental research will depend largely on substantial and stable funding for this research from the Federal Government.

Second, research in the private sector and industry is important in bringing the fruits of understanding-driven research to society through applied research.

Third, science and math education, the development of our Nation's intellectual capital, is fundamentally important to our Nation's future.

While the freedom of individual researchers is necessary to bring about ground-breaking scientific discoveries, it is crucial that the scientific and engineering enterprise strengthen its ties to society, the taxpayers, who support it. Our report suggests a number of ways to do so.

In addition, science has another role, and that is to help us make decisions, as a society, as a government, within both the regulatory sector and the judicial branch, as individuals and as voters. We must develop and strengthen our ability to draw on science and engineering to help us make decisions, and our report suggests ways to bring this about.

In writing a document that adhered to my initial goals, in that it should be coherent, comprehensive, and yet concise, we were not able to address any particular issue or aspect of the scientific enterprise in great depth.

Because the report is so comprehensive, encompassing not only the role of the Congress or the Federal Government but also the private sector and our entire education system, it does not explore any particular issue in great depth. It is instead a broad-brush view of the entire science and engineering enterprise.

In part because of this "big picture" approach, this report is the beginning of a process, not the end of one.

The work of addressing specific science policy issues will have to come later. I am gratified, in fact, that the additional views submitted by some committee members indicate a desire to pursue further issues raised in the report. It is my hope that we will do so in the next Congress.

Much hard work remains. We must address these issues that are so critical to maintaining our science and technology enterprise. Let's start that process. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago at the Science Policy Study Kick-off Roundtable, Speaker Gingrich said, and I quote, "You give me a mission large enough to mobilize the Nation. You give me a set of strategic investments large enough to be worth doing, and then make it my problem to go out and figure out how to find the money."

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) accepted this challenge, and I commend him on his efforts to lay down a national policy for science, math, engineering, and technology.

In setting policy, decisions must be made about the direction this country should move in, the precedence we are willing to set, and the scientific agenda for the coming years.

The problem with this report is that, and this has been already acknowledged, so I am not trying to beat a dead horse, the Speaker sought a bold visionary document, and what he got was a document which, valuable as it is, still satisfies mainly the needs of the status quo.

The Speaker, in reviewing the report at the press conference with which it was announced said this is a very good start, but it really only scratches the surface of what over the next 4 or 5 years will have to be a very important national dialogue.

This is the situation that we are in. I like the report as far as it goes. I think I can echo what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) said. But I have cast my role here in the Congress at trying to

look beyond the status quo at what needs to be done to solve the problems of the future. To me, this report does not go far enough in terms of that particular kind of goal.

So I am going to offer and I have offered to continue to work with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) whose contribution is very valuable. I have gone through many science policy reports over the last 30-odd years. I think this is the first one that I have seen that was completed on time and under budget. I think any person who can do that in dealing with a complex subject like this deserves to be commended.

What I do think we need to do now is to accept the judgment of the Speaker that we need to continue working in this direction and to give our very best efforts to doing that.

The gentlewoman from Texas has pointed out some of the areas in which we need to continue working. This report, incidentally, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) has indicated is very acceptable to the research universities of this country and to those who benefit from the present establishment of science.

They like the idea of the Congress committing itself to provide more money for what they are already doing, and they will be glad to spend that. That is not the problem.

The question now is what social purpose are we serving through the expenditure of that money? We no longer can justify on the grounds of, let us say, national security, although we will continue to spend some money on that, but that will continue to decline. We need to look for new ways of answering the question, for what purpose are we supporting this very large scientific establishment that we have created.

I happen to feel that such an establishment is of very great value, but I think we need to look at a new paradigm in terms of the purpose of that establishment and what it can do to achieve the goals of human society.

I know that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) referred to the need for greater democracy on this planet. Our good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) in his eloquent remarks this morning quoted from Madison's Federalist Paper Number 51 on the problems of justice and how to achieve them.

The physical sciences cannot solve those kinds of problems, but it is conceivable that newly developing areas of science, in the social sciences, the cognitive sciences, interdisciplinary science, a number of other areas might cast some light on this age-old search for a more effective, just society that we have not yet achieved.

We sometimes almost look as if we are not even coming closer to it. But we need to use the best minds of this society to work on the most important goals, the goals of the highest priority to this society. This is the mind-set

that we have to inculcate in the scientific leadership of this country today.

I am not discouraged at the possibility of doing that. I think this report, perhaps, does give us a framework in which we can move forward in that direction. But because I feel that it is my goal to continue to be the doubting Thomas and to focus on the needs of the future, I am going to withhold my support. I did this in committee, I might say, although I did not make any effort to influence the other members of the committee.

I can tell you that more than 75 percent of the Committee on Science have signed their approval of this, which I think is probably a figure that ought to be even exceeded by the full House.

But I am going to play the role that I have chosen, hoping that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) will understand that I feel that, that way, I can make the greatest contribution to moving us forward along some of the more unorthodox paths that we need to follow if science is truly going to be the asset to this society that I know it can be.

Mr. Speaker, one year ago, at the Science Policy Study Kick-off Roundtable, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH said: "You give me a mission large enough to mobilize the nation. You give me a set of strategic investments large enough to be worth doing, and then make it my problem to go out and figure out how to find the money."

Representative EHLERS accepted this challenge and I commend him on his effort to lay down a national policy for science, math, engineering, and technology.

In setting policy, decisions must be made about the direction this country should move in, the precedents we are willing to set, and the scientific agenda for the coming years. Unfortunately, these are precisely the decisions that were absent from the report.

The speaker sought a bold, visionary document; what he got was largely an affirmation of the status quo.

Any discussion surrounding this report or this broad topic must be put in context and not viewed as an isolated event. This Science Policy Report is not the first of its kind—not even the first such study by the Science Committee—and it will not be the last.

Over the last two decades I can point to a long string of incremental steps in the evolution of our thinking on science policy. In fact, I can find twenty significant studies on national science and technology policy just within the last few years, and I would ask permission to append this list to these remarks.

Twenty-two years ago, President Gerald Ford helped redefine the federal role in science policy with the signing of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976, a major work of the House Science and Technology Committee. While the Act was signed by the President, it was never fully implemented.

However, it did lead to the further definition of the federal role in technology transfer and advanced technology development in the 1988 Trade Bill signed by President Reagan. The Trade Bill then opened up a restructuring of

the broad area of Government-Industry-University cooperation as one way to making the U.S. industrial system more competitive with the national systems of Europe and Asia, which historically had encouraged closer ties between government and industry.

During the Bush Administration, under the skilled guidance of his Science Advisor, Dr. D. Allan Bromley, and with the input of many science and technology organizations, continued progress was made in improving the process of innovation, of moving new inventions and technologies from the labs to the marketplace, and defining, through the device of cooperative research and development agreements, the legal structure for individual institutional agreements.

With the end of the Cold War, this policy debate has intensified. The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology issued a report in 1992 on the health of research.

The Clinton Administration has attempted to make this imprint on science policy with the 1994 report, "Science in the National Interest," a product of the Office of Science and Technology Policy. This report prompted Congressional hearings and a renewed discussion of science and technology policy at the national level.

With this historical perspective in mind, I would offer some guiding principles for an ongoing dialogue about the future of science policy.

First, a new science policy should reflect our understanding of the process of creativity and innovation. Second, a new science policy should articulate the public's interest supporting science—the goals and values the public should expect of the scientific enterprise. Third, a new science policy should point towards decision-making tools for better investment choices.

With respect to our understanding of the process of creativity and innovation, virtually no one still believes in the Vannevar Bush-era linear model of scientific breakthroughs leading inexorably to technological developments.

Despite report language endorsing a more sophisticated model of science and technology innovations arising through an iterative process, the Ehlers report ultimately puts its money on the old linear model by emphasizing Federal support for "basic" research. The report provides no guidance on how the Federal government should determine that a "market failure" has occurred in the downstream parts of the R&D process or what types of policies would be appropriate to redress such failures. I think we should work together to develop a policy on the appropriate limits of Federal support that fits with our understanding of how innovation actually works. Let's put our money where our model is.

Further, the Ehlers report seems to support the traditional "hard" sciences with only passing mentions of engineering, biology, biotechnology, the social sciences or the cognitive and policy sciences. I think we need a more holistic conception of what constitutes important science and worthwhile endeavors. An argument can be made that the most pressing issues facing our society—crime, education reform, social justice—are more likely to be addressed through investments in social science rather than in the hard sciences. Yet, the report is silent on the need to support this important research.

Next, concerning the public's interest in supporting science and what goals and values the

public should expect of the scientific enterprise, it was over fifty years ago that Vannevar Bush argued that science was worth public support because it could "insure our health, prosperity, and security as a nation in the modern world." I think those general goals are still valid today. However, I also believe that we need to do a more rational job of identifying specific social needs that science can help us remedy. What are the long term goals for society which the public should expect from these investments? To put it simply, science for what end? It isn't enough to declare science a public good and walk away from the table.

When we use public resources to support science and technology, we should clearly identify the public purposes which we desire to achieve.

In addition to clearly articulating the goals for science, we need to squarely face the values that science can help enhance or undermine. I am particularly concerned about the possibility that increasing technological sophistication and maldistribution of educational opportunity could create a two-tiered society. What steps can we take to guarantee that we do not become a society of technological haves and have nots? This is a question of justice and equity in access to science education, and to the fruits of the scientific and technological enterprise.

To give an example, it is unfair to use public funds for biomedical research if the fruits of that research are so expensive that only a handful of the most economically advantaged can enjoy them. That is a hidden redistribution of wealth and life-expectancy from poorer Americans to richer Americans under the guise of "basic" research in the life sciences. A new science policy must wrestle with these type of questions.

Another example can be found in the disparity that continues to exist between the number of white males and the number of women and minorities who have access to and pursue higher education in science and technology fields.

Some projections show that by the Year 2000, two-thirds of the new entrants into the American workforce will be made up of minorities and women. These numbers present a compelling argument for inclusion of these groups when one considers sources of scientific capital, the make-up of our workforce, and the nation's consumer base. Therefore, the question is not if, but when, we will begin to seriously tackle the issue of underrepresentation of these groups. Any comprehensive policy effort must address the inclusion of under-represented groups and acknowledge the future implications for the economy and society if we fail.

And lastly, as regards our decision-making tools for better investment choices. In addition to identifying clear goals and values, a new science policy should point towards methods for making better decisions. Some of the elements for that are in place. For example, the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) challenges our agencies to develop comprehensive goals and measurements. However, in research and development programs, GPRA is still a fairly blunt instrument and is in need of fine-tuning.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy is in a position to provide some overall coordination for our science policy, but it doesn't

always have the muscle to make its desires stick with executive agencies.

Congress has creative leadership in both parties on science policy questions, but we suffer from a disorganized process for passing authorization and appropriation bills that leads to suboptimal outcomes. I think that we need to tackle all of these elements of decision-making as we move towards a more rational analysis of the major problems facing society—affordable health, broadly based economic opportunity, sustainable environmental policies and social discontent—and of the science needed to address those problems.

Science policy must try to accommodate a complex system that has been and will continue to change with increasing regularity. For this reason we need a policy document that reflects our understanding of the process of creativity and innovation, articulates the public's interest in supporting science, and points towards decision-making tools for better investment choices. Only then can we set forth goals that: (1) Are broad and sustainable, (2) form an overall picture of what we want our future on this planet to be, and (3) are based ultimately on societal needs and our desire to improve the human condition.

Over the course of my career I have issued challenges to legislators, agencies, and the science community to set goals, define priorities, think in a global context, move beyond the limits imposed by discrete disciplines, and to find ways science, engineering, and technology can help society advance. The National Science Policy report written under the direction of Congressman EHLERS is clearly an attempt to move the science, engineering, and technology fields forward, but ultimately it fails to adequately address the pressing issues that face the scientific enterprise and society in coming years. Therefore, I cannot agree that a Science Policy Report that fails to tackle these challenges is "a framework for future deliberations on congressional science policy and funding" as H. Res. 578 states.

I offer any help I can to Mr. EHLERS in continuing this dialogue, but I will withhold my support for the resolution before us today.

20 RECENT SCIENCE POLICY REPORTS

1991—U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, "Federally Funded Research: Decisions for a Decade."

1992—U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Science, Space and Technology, "Report of the Task Force on Health of Research: Chairman's Report."

1992—Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government, "Enabling the Future: Linking Science and Technology to Societal Goals."

1992—Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology, "In the National Interest: The Federal Government and Research-Intensive Universities."

1992—Competitiveness Policy Council, "First Annual Report To the President and Congress—Building a Competitive America."

1992—President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, "Renewing the Promise: Research-Intensive Universities and the Nation."

1993—National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, "Science, Technology, and the Federal Government: National Goals for a New Era."

1993—Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government, "Science, Technology and Government for a Changing World."

1994—Executive Office of the President, President Clinton/VP Gore, Office of Science and Technology Policy, "Science in the National Interest."

1995—National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, "Reshaping the Graduate Education of Scientists and Engineers."

1995—Executive Office of the President, The Council of Economic Advisors, "Supporting Research and Development to Promote Economic Growth: The Federal Government Role."

1995—National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, "Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology."

1996—National Science Foundation, "National Patterns of R&D Resources."

1996—Council on Competitiveness, "Endless Frontier, Limited Resource: U.S. R&D Policy for Competitiveness."

1996—Executive Office of the President, President Clinton/VP Gore, Office of Science and Technology Policy, "Technology in the National Interest."

1996—Office of the Vice President for Research, University of Michigan, "The Future of the Government/University Partnership."

1996—U.S. Department of Commerce, "Effective Partnering: A Report to Congress on Federal Technology Partnerships."

1997—Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy, "Science and Technology Shaping the Twenty-first Century."

1997—Lewis Branscomb et al., Harvard University, Center for Science and International Affairs, "Investing in Innovation, Toward a Consensus Strategy for Federal Technology Policy."

1997—National Science Board, "Government Funding of Scientific Research."

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words and insight of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN). I think that we are quite proud of the fact, not only was this report completed on time and on budget, which we like to do in the Committee on Science, but also this is one of the first congressional initiatives on any major topic looking into the future that is our own product rather than a reaction from something that has come from the Executive Branch or private industry or the university.

I would like to see the Congress continue in this type of creative venture where we look at how we can better the type of quality of life that we will be bequeathing to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of H.Res. 578, a resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Committee on Science's report entitled "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy" should serve as a framework for maintaining and strengthening our U.S. science policy for the 21st Century.

I, first of all, want to acknowledge the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the vice

chairman, for their leadership and commitment toward a renewed focus on U.S. science policy and for their effort to produce the report that is before us this evening.

As my colleagues know, the Committee on Science has held many, many hearings over the last year covering all aspects of science policy. I applaud their work, support the recommendations set forth in the committee's report.

I do want to say that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) had many, many hearings in crafting together this science policy, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member of the full committee, was also there at many of those meetings. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), as a leader, has done an extraordinary job.

The science policy study, in part, focuses on the need to revitalize our Nation's educational system to ensure that students at every level, from K through 12 through university, have the skills necessary to excel in all areas of math and science.

The study also advocates promoting more flexibility in graduate level science and engineering programs to encourage more student participation. But most importantly, the study stresses the need to do more to address the underrepresentation of women and minorities in science and engineering fields.

To that end, the study indicates the passage of H.R. 3007, the Commission on the Advancement of Women in Science, Engineering and Technology Development, is an important step in achieving that goal.

H.R. 3007, which I introduced last fall, establishes a commission to identify and address the problems associated with the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women and minorities in science, engineering, and technology development.

The commission will be comprised of representatives from both private businesses and academia and will provide Congress with a list of policy recommendations that will help break down the barriers that women and minorities face in trying to become scientists and engineers.

As my colleagues know, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3007 under suspension of the rules on September 13. I am pleased to report that the Senate approved the legislation last week and that H.R. 3007 is now awaiting the President's signature.

I see also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is here in the chamber. It was jointly referred also to his committee, and I am pleased that that committee also gave its seal of approval. So we are already on our way of addressing some of the critical issues raised in the science policy study.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Vice Chairman

EHLERS) for their hard work. I support the recommendations in the report unlocking our future toward a new national science policy. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle next Congress to further promote a strong U.S. science policy.

□ 2045

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the idea of a science policy statement is a very valuable idea. As a member of the House Committee on Science, I have wanted for a long time that we bring focus around the issues we work with. However, I think it is important to note that we have a long way to go, and what we might be able to add to this process is an understanding of greater creativity and innovation in science and expanding the public's desire to participate in science, as well as to understand the science investments that this country makes. We also need better decision-making tools that will engage our scientists around the Nation so that we can make the right choices of investment.

Then, although we speak about education in this policy statement, I think it is extremely important that we reflect more on the K through 12. One of our most important challenges is to encourage our young people to be interested in the sciences, to desire to participate in the sciences, and by that we must professionally develop our teachers, and we must work on the K through 12 development.

So I would hope that as we conclude this study, that we will look to do more and make it better to expand the interests of science throughout the Nation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me close my remarks by expressing my appreciation and respect for both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for both accepting this responsibility and for producing this report. I am pleased to have the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) acknowledge that this report is a commencement. I believe sincerely that he is willing and open to having more input as related to the areas I have identified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 578.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING IMPORTANCE OF MAMMOGRAPHY AND BIOPSIES IN FIGHTING BREAST CANCER

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 565) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of mammograms and biopsies in the fight against breast cancer.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 565

Whereas 1 in 8 women will develop breast cancer in her lifetime;

Whereas nearly 180,000 American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year, and nearly 44,000 women will die of the disease;

Whereas breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death of women between the ages of 40 and 55;

Whereas it is universally recognized that regular mammograms are the best way to detect breast cancer at its earliest, most treatable stages, and that mammograms can detect small breast cancers up to 2 years earlier than they can be detected through self-examination;

Whereas early detection, including regular mammography screening with prompt treatment, could result in one-third fewer breast cancer deaths among women over age 50;

Whereas the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute recognize that regular mammograms are beneficial to women in their forties and recommend that women begin mammography screening by age 40;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention determined in 1995 that nearly half of American women age 50 and older, and more than one-third of American women age 40 to 49, had not received a mammogram in the previous year;

Whereas annual mammograms are essential in early detection of breast cancer, and biopsies are the only way to diagnose or rule out breast cancer with certainty;

Whereas it is vital that women have information about breast biopsy and the biopsy options that are available to them;

Whereas cutting-edge technology in women's health is creating more options for women; and

Whereas greater awareness of the importance of mammograms leads to more mammograms and biopsies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) all American women should take an active role in the fight against breast cancer by all the means that are available to them, including self-examination, physician examination, and regular mammograms;

(2) the role played by community organizations and health care providers in promoting awareness of the importance of regular mammograms and of biopsy options and in helping to expand the availability of low-cost mammograms and biopsies should be recognized and applauded; and

(3) the Federal Government has a responsibility to—

(A) endeavor to raise awareness about the importance of the early detection (through

mammography and biopsy) and prompt treatment of breast cancer;

(B) continue to fund research so that the causes of and a cure for breast cancer may be discovered; and

(C) continue to make mammograms and biopsies more widely available to women over 40.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 565, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of mammograms and biopsies in the fight against breast cancer. I salute the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for this commendable resolution.

According to the General Accounting Office's testimony this past May before the Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed nonskin cancer and the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women. Experts estimate that during the 1990s, as many as 1.8 million women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, and 500,000 will die from it. According to 1997 data, an estimated 44,000 women died from breast cancer, and an estimated 180,200 new cases of the disease were diagnosed.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that these women are not mere numbers. They are mothers, daughters, friends, and colleagues. Breast cancer has struck the families of my staff. It has even struck my own wife.

The fact that 1 in 9 women will develop breast cancer at some point in their lives is a frightening prospect, but there is hope. Awareness leads to vigilance, which leads to early detection. This resolution before us helps build the awareness needed to survive.

As my own family found out, the probability of survival, as well as the use of breast-conserving therapy and the avoidance of mastectomy increases significantly when the disease is discovered in its early stages. Currently, the most effective technique for early detection of breast cancer is screening mammography, an X-ray procedure that can detect small tumors and breast abnormalities up to 2 years before they can be detected by touch, and

over 90 percent of these early-stage cancers can be cured, according to the FDA.

The use of mammography as a tool for detecting early cancer continues to increase. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the proportion of women aged 50 and older who had received mammograms in the prior year increased from 26 percent in 1987 to 57 percent in 1995. The proportion of women 40 to 49 who had received mammograms in the past 2 years also increased from 59 percent in 1990 to 66 percent in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that our committee has done more than simply build awareness about this dreaded disease. Just 3 weeks ago on September 15, the House joined unanimously the Committee on Commerce in passing H.R. 4382, the Bliley-Bilirakis Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act of 1998. This bill will assure the safety, accuracy and overall quality in mammography services for the early detection of breast cancer. Women who seek mammograms, however, must be assured that their results will be accurate and not misleading.

Bliley-Bilirakis provides for direct patient notification of all mammography examinations in writing, and in easily understood terms so that women are fully aware of their results. As the August 4 joint letter of endorsement from the American Cancer Society, the National Alliance of Breast Cancer Organizations and the Susan Gomen Breast Cancer Foundation states, "Studies have shown that women believe their mammography results are normal if they are not contacted after their examination. An increasing number of mammography facilities have begun to report both normal and abnormal findings directly to the women as well as her referring physician, without disrupting the relationships with her referring provider."

The other body passed Bliley-Bilirakis without amendment. It has languished on the President's desk for a full week now. It merits his signature.

Mr. Speaker, the month of October is breast cancer awareness month. Today is a fitting day for the House of Representatives to add its voice to the voice of many other dedicated citizens in this country to express the importance of early mammographies and biopsies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 565. As we all know, breast cancer is one of the leading causes of death among women in this country. By combining early detection of breast cancer with prompt treatment, we can reduce the number of deaths by as much as one-third.

Although these facts are known, only half of all women over the age of 50 and